DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 848 EA 018 377

AUTHOR Cook, Gillian E.; DeLuca, Nicholas M.
TITLE Managerial Styles of Prospective Instructional Supervisors and Educational Administrators.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Education; Administrators; Educational Administration; Higher Education; Individual Characteristics; *Leadership Styles; Leadership Training; Management Development; Middle Management; Principals; *Supervision; *Supervisory Training
IDENTIFIERS University of Texas San Antonio

ABSTRACT

Students seeking certification in supervision and those seeking certification in educational administration were compared in order to examine differences in leadership styles. One hundred forty-nine educational administration students and 121 supervision students participated in the study at the University of Texas at San Antonio. Four self-assessment instruments were used to measure dimensions of leadership style. The data suggested differences in style and organizational orientation between administration and supervision students. Administration students tended to be more task oriented, extroverted, and directive. The recommendations that followed from these findings were: (1) students in supervision and administration should be aware of leadership style models and should be able to assess their own leadership style; (2) techniques that encourage exploration of simulated and real life situations should be incorporated into training programs for supervisors and administrators; (3) training programs should provide for exchange of views among students with different goals in administration and supervision; and (4) ongoing professional development and training programs should be provided for all personnel in administrative and supervisory positions. School districts should also take leadership styles into account when assigning personnel and should make leadership into a team effort whenever possible. Twenty-two references are appended. (GJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED269848

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gillian E. Cook

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MANAGERIAL STYLES OF PROSPECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORS AND EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

GILLIAN E COOK
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

NICHOLAS M DELUCA
JUDSON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

EA 018 377

Paper presented at the 1986 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, April 16-20, 1986

MANAGERIAL STYLES OF PROSPECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORS
AND EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

Introduction

Leadership style has been a topic of research for at least thirty-five years. In 1951, Bales introduced the concepts of task-oriented behavior and socio-emotional behavior to describe two types of leadership. These key dimensions recur in many studies of leadership style. Blake and Mouton (1964) developed their managerial grid, based on these same dimensions which they called "concern for production" and "concern for people", and identified five ideal-type combinations of style, one of which (high concern for production/high concern for people) was perceived as the most desirable managerial style.

Reddin (1970) and Fiedler (1970), using the same key dimensions, stressed that no one style is effective in all situations. This situational approach to leadership was further developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1977), who used maturity level of the follower as the variable to determine appropriate leadership style. Other researchers in the area of situational leadership include Vroom (1973) and Glickman (1981).

McGregor (1960), in his examination of the assumptions and beliefs of managers, compared two ideal-type management philosophies which he called Theory X and Theory Y. Argyris (1971) identified Patterns of Behavior which were typically linked with Theory X and Theory Y assumptions. The Theory Y assumptions and associated Pattern B behaviors have much in common with Blake and Mouton's ideal (9.9) managerial type.

Another approach was developed by Myers (1962), who based her work on the psychological concepts identified by Jung (1921). Her typology includes four pairs of dimensions which help to characterize a person's style. While this typology is not related specifically to leadership style, the pairs of dimensions, particularly those of introversion and extroversion, and of perceiving and judging, have clear implications for leadership behavior.

Background to the Study

A study of research on leadership styles, and the implications of this research for educational leaders, forms part of the syllabus in the introductory courses in Educational Administration and in Supervision at the University of Texas at San Antonio. In order to introduce the concepts and models of leadership

style, in both courses students use instruments related to Jungian typology, leadership orientation, managerial assumptions, and style adaptability to assess their own leadership styles. Some years ago, in casual conversation, the instructors of the introductory courses found that there seemed to be some overall differences in leadership style between those students preparing to be educational administrators and those preparing to be instructional supervisors. This hunch led to the development of a pilot study and then to the present study.

In Texas, there are several different professional certificates for educational leaders. The Professional School Administrator Certificate (Mid-Management) (45 semester hours) is designed for principals and other administrators, primarily those in line positions in the school or central office; the Professional School Administrator Certificate (Superintendent) requires sixteen additional semester hours of training for those seeking the upper level district leadership positions. The Professional Supervisor Certificate (30 semester hours) provides training for instructional supervisors at the school and district level, such as department chairpersons, campus coordinators, and district supervisors (often staff positions).

At The University of Texas at San Antonio, there is little overlap between the Educational Administration program and the Supervision program. All degree-seeking graduate students take 12 semester hours of core courses (only nine of which are required for the Professional Supervisor Certificate). Students then take courses in one of several concentrations, such as Educational Administration or Curriculum and Instruction (Supervision). It is rare for students in Educational Administration to take Supervision courses or vice versa. Similarly, students who enter with a master's degree in order to take courses leading to a professional certification take either Educational Management or Supervision courses, not both. The population for each program is therefore a completely separate group. In our study, students were enrolled either in the Educational Administration Program or in the Supervision program. No student was taking courses in both programs.

This phenomenon provided us with a way to compare the two groups. The purpose of our study was to examine differences in leadership style between students seeking certification in supervision and those seeking certification in educational administration.

Rationale

An examination of the literature concerning the roles and tasks expected of instructional supervisors suggests that these roles and tasks are geared towards the improvement of instruction through direct interaction with teachers (cp. Harris, 1975; Wiles and Lovell, 1975; Alfonso, Firth and Neville, 1981; Oliva, 1984). Administrative behavior, on the other hand, may be described as "action toward achievement of schools goals...(that) is not dependent upon others for success." (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1983, p.12).

This comparison of supervisory and administrative roles is of course very simplistic, particularly in the light of current work on the principal as instructional leader. However, there is no doubt that our program supports these roles. In the Professional School Administrator Certificate (Mid-Management) program, 18 semester hours are directly related to management concerns (finance, legal foundations, etc.) while only 3 semester hours are applied to human relations, which are seen primarily in terms of school and community relations. In the Professional Supervisor Certificate program, nine hours are courses in supervision, three are in curriculum, and nine are courses in subject matter areas. There are no management courses in this program.

It might be expected then, that those students entering the Educational Administration program perceive themselves more as task-oriented "managers", while prospective supervisors tend to see themselves as more "people" oriented. This study was undertaken to examine whether this supposition is supported.

Apart from a curiosity about the expectations and perceptions of the students in our classes, we had a more pragmatic reason for undertaking this study. In Texas, as in much of the rest of the nation, the supervisory and administrative roles tend to overlap. Central office supervisors are increasingly spending their time on administrative tasks instead of working directly with teachers. At the same time recent legislature, and current educational trends, are requiring that mid-managers, particularly principals, become more people-oriented, and take a greater role as instructional leaders. Re-training for these new roles and expectations is taking place both formally and informally. It is important for those of us who are engaged in the preparation and retraining of educational administrators and instructional supervisors to know something of the leadership styles of our students. Do prospective administrators and prospective supervisors have different leadership styles?

The Pilot Study

In the Spring of 1982, four instruments designed to measure different aspects of leadership style were administered to 44 educational management students and 26 supervision students, and the findings of this study (DeLuca and Cook, 1982) led to the development of the following hypotheses, which formed the basis of the current study.

Hypotheses

1. In terms of psychological typology (Jung, 1921, Myers, 1962), there is no significant difference between educational administration students (EA) and supervision students(S) in the following dimensions:

introversion	extroversion
intuition	sensing
thinking	feeling

   but in the dimension of perceiving/judging, EA students tend to be more strongly judgmental than S students.
2. In terms of task orientation/relations orientation (Blake and Mouton, 1964), EA students have a higher task orientation than S students.
3. There is no significant difference between EA students and S students in terms of style adaptability (Hershey and Blanchard, 1977).
4. In terms of management philosophy (McGregor, 1960), both EA and S students demonstrate a preference toward Theory Y assumption. However, the preference is stronger among S students.

The Study

a. Participants

The four instruments used in the pilot study and described below were administered to all students in the introductory course in each of the Professional Educational Administrator Certificate program and the Professional Supervisor Certificate program each time the course was offered between Summer 1982 and Fall 1985, a total of 8 educational administration courses and 8 supervision courses.

The number of students who completed the four instruments were 149 Educational Administration students and 121 Supervision students.

b. The Instruments

Four instruments were used to measure dimensions of leadership style:

I) Personal Style Inventory (Hogan and Champagne, 1980) "designed to measure a person's Jungian typology, a construct first described by Jung (1921) and later elucidated by Myers (1962)." (Hogan and Champagne, 1980, p. 89)

II) T-P Leadership Questionnaire, related to Blake and Mouton's managerial grid. (Blake and Mouton, 1964)

III. Organizational Reaction Form, designed to elicit reactions to statements in McGregor's Managerial Propositions (McGregor, 1966, p.5)

IV. Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory (Hersey and Blanchard, 1981), "designed to measure (one's) self-perception of three aspects of leader behavior: (1) style, (2) style range and (3) style adaptability." (Hersey and Blanchard, 1981, p. 34)

It should be noted that all these instruments are self-assessment instruments, and therefore are clearly subjective in nature. As Hersey and Blanchard (1981, p. 36) suggest, there is a difference between self-perception of leadership style and "actual" leadership style (as perceived by others). This study deals entirely with self-perceptions.

Perceptual psychology offers a strong rationale for such an approach. People tend to behave according to their perceptions of themselves. As Combs and Avila (1985, p.34) indicate, "The self-concept exerts its influence on every aspect of human endeavor." They also discuss (pp.34-35), the "circular effect" of the self-concept, and suggests that "this self-corroborating characteristic gives the self-concept a high degree of stability."

The powerful effect of perceptions is supported by McGregor (1960), and suggests that human behavior is an organization is approximately what management perceives it to be, and by Hogan and Champagne (1981) who state that "values and assumptions affect thinking and interaction."

It is therefore likely that the perceptions that our students have concerning their own leadership beliefs and behavior have a strong effect upon those beliefs and that behavior.

Findings

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES ON X AND Y DIMENSIONS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL REACTION FORM

	Dimension X	Y*
Supervision Students	7.9	11.6
Educational Administration Students	7.7	10.6

*P=.01 N=270

The data presented in Table I reflect student orientations toward Theory X and Theory Y. Both Supervision and Administration students are more oriented toward Theory Y than toward Theory X. There is however, a significant difference in the degree of orientation. Supervision students are more strongly oriented toward Theory Y than Administration students.

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES ON TASK AND PEOPLE DIMENSIONS OF THE MANAGERIAL GRID

	Task*	People
Supervision Students	2.6	6.6
Administration Students	3.8	6.6

*P=.001 N=270

Table II contains the data comparing mean scores on the Task and People dimensions of the managerial grid. A significant difference was found between the two groups on the Task dimensions. The educational administration students demonstrated a significantly higher task orientation than did supervision students. Both groups had a mean score of 6.6 on the people dimension.

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF PREFERENCE SCORES OF ADMINISTRATION STUDENTS AND SUPERVISION STUDENTS ON FOUR SETS OF DICHOTOMOUS DIMENSIONS OF THE PERSONAL STYLE INVENTORY

	Supervision	Administration
Introversion	33	51
Extroversion	88	98
Intuition	65	64
Sensing	56	85
Thinking	33	65
Feeling	88	84
Perceiving	33	16*
Judging	88	133

N=270 *P=.05

The preference scores achieved by administration and supervision students on the four sets of dichotomous dimensions of the Personal Style Inventory are arrayed in Table III. Only the perceiving/judging dimension reveals a significant difference between administration and supervision students personal preference styles. Educational administration students tend to be more strongly judgmental than do the supervision students.

TABLE IV

MEAN SCORES

LEADERSHIP ADAPTABILITY STYLE INVENTORY

HIGH

Relationship		
	3 SUP. 4.0 ADM. 3.8	2 SUP. 5.8 ADM. 5.3
	4 SUP. 0.6 ADM. 0.5	1 SUP. 1.5 Adm. 2.4

LOW HIGH

TASK ADAPTABILITY MEAN SCORE

SUPERVISION STUDENTS	8.8
ADMINISTRATION STUDENTS	8.3
N=270	

The mean scores generated by Hersey & Blanchard LASI instrument are arrayed in Table IV.

There are no statistically different mean scores. The mean score for Quadrant I for administration is 2.4 and supervision students is 1.5. While the difference is not statistically significant it is large.

Summary

The data from the four instruments suggests difference in style and organizational orientations between administration and supervision students. Simply said, administration students tend to be more task oriented, extroverted and directive than do supervision students. We find this to be interesting and in need of more detailed examination.

Recommendations

The recommendations arising from this study fall into two parts: implications for training, and implications for personnel assignment.

a. Implications for Training

The analysis of the data indicates some overall similarities and differences between Educational Administration (EA) and Supervision (S) students. What this analysis does not show, but what examination of the data suggests, is that there are also differences in leadership style within each group.

Given these findings and indications, the following recommendations are made:

I) that students in training for leadership positions become aware of different models of leadership style, and are given opportunities to assess their own leadership styles;

II) that in order to assist students to broaden their own range of leadership styles, and to develop greater style adaptability, techniques which encourage exploration of simulated and real life situations (e.g. case studies) be widely incorporated in training programs;

III) that training programs provide for exchange of views among students with different career goals in educational administration and supervision, so that various leadership assumptions, psychological typologies, and management styles may be examined, and their possible effects and implications may be explored in a thoughtful analytic environment; and

IV) that on-going professional development and training programs be provided for all personnel in administrative and supervisory positions, and that such programs take into consideration the differing leadership styles and role-expectations of participants.

b. Implications for Personnel Assignment

In an organizational and human system as complicated as a school district, or a school, it is obvious that different tasks and situations call for different leadership styles. To expect one person to be able to use a wide variety of appropriate styles, while desirable, is usually unrealistic. The following recommendations are therefore offered:

I) that leadership assumptions, style, and adaptability be taken into account in hiring educational leaders;

II) that the organization be flexible enough for a leader with a particularly dominant leadership style to be placed in a situation where that style is appropriate; and

III) that where possible, leadership be a team effort, so that personnel with differing leadership styles can work together and use their individual strengths to provide the most appropriate leadership in a given situation.

Bibliography

Alfonso, R.J., Firth, G.R., and Neville, R.F. Instructional Supervision: A Behavior System. (2nd Ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1981.

Argyris, C. Management and Organization Development. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Bales, R.F. Interaction Process Analysis. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1951.

Blake, R. and Mouton, J. The Managerial Grid. Houston: Gulf, 1964.

Combs, A.W. and Avila, D.L. Helping Relationships. (3rd Ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1985.

DeLuca, N. and Cook, G.E. Managerial Styles of Prospective Instructional Supervisors and Educational Administrators (Unpublished Paper), 1983.

Fiedler, F.E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Glickman, C.D. Developmental Supervision. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 1981

Harris, B.M. Supervisory Behavior in Education. (2nd Ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K.H. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. (3rd Ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K.H. So You Want to Know Your Leadership Style? Training and Development Journal, 35 n6 (June 1981) pp 34-54.

Hogan, R.C. and Champagne, D.W. Personal Style Inventory in Pfeiffer, W. & Jones, J.E. (eds) The 1980 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators, San Diego, CA: University Associates, 1980.

Jung, C.G. Personality Types. In Collected Works (Vol. VI), Princeton, NJ: Bollingen Press, 1921.

McGregor, D. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

McGregor, D. The Human Side of Enterprise. in Bennis, W.G. and Schein, E.H. (Eds) Leadership and Motivation: Essays of Douglas McGregor. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1966.

Myers, I.B. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1962.

Oliva, P.E. Supervision for Today's Schools. (2nd Ed.) New York: Longman, 1984.

Reddin, W.J. Managerial Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Sergiovanni, T.J. and Starratt, R.J. Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.

Vroom, V. Leadership Revisited. in Carr, E. and Zimmer, F. (Eds) Man and Work in Society. New York: Van Nostrand, 1975.

Wiles, K. and Lovell, J.T. Supervision for Better Schools. (4th Ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1975.